



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

KIRT REPP DC
PO BOX 9973
THE WOODLANDS TX 77387

Respondent Name

NEW HAMPSHIRE INSURANCE CO

Carrier's Austin Representative

Box Number 19

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-13-1704-01

MFDR Date Received

MARCH 5, 2013

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "the carrier failed to adjudicate the claim properly as we received no EOB and/or EOR as required by governing rule."

Amount in Dispute: \$6,805.00

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "Dr. Repp is correct that no Explanation of Benefit Forms were sent him. That is because his billing never reached the medical bill review division. The number he faxed his bill to on 03/30/12...I do not find to be an AIG or Chartis fax number. His fax of 02/01/13 to 866-739-6983 is a fax number for the Dallas Claims Service Center. The Carrier received the request for consideration on 02/01/13, which is the first evidence of any bill received by the carrier for this date of service. The Carrier requests that you find the Requestor is due no reimbursement as the bill was not timely submitted per the Texas Labor Code requirements. Also, it appears the services are for NCV/EMG studies which are beyond the scope of practice of a doctor of chiropractic."

Response Submitted By: AIG

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
March 5, 2012	CPT Code 99202	\$170.00	\$117.14
	CPT Code 95861	\$425.00	\$0.00
	CPT Code 95934-50	\$250.00	\$99.61
	CPT Code 95903 (X8)	\$295.00/each	\$972.33
	CPT Code 95904 (X16)	\$225.00/each	\$1,469.40
TOTAL		\$6,805.00	\$2,658.48

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, effective May 25, 2008, 33 *Texas Register* 3954, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. Texas Labor Code §408.0272, effective September 1, 2007, provides for certain exceptions for untimely submission of claim.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203, effective March 1, 2008, 33 *Texas Register* 364, sets the reimbursement guidelines for the disputed service.
4. 22 Texas Administrative Code §75, effective December 24, 2009, 34 *Texas Register* 9208, sets out the scope of practice for chiropractors.
5. District Court of Travis County, 250th Judicial District No. D-1-N-GN-06-003451, Honorable Stephen Yelenosky, Judge Presiding, Order on cross-motions for partial summary judgment dated November 24, 2009.
6. Texas Court of Appeals, Third District at Austin, NO. 03-10-00673-CV, Opinion dated April 5, 2012.
7. Texas Court of Appeals, Third District at Austin, NO. 03-10-00673-CV, Mandate dated August 8, 2013.
8. Neither party to this dispute submitted copies of explanation of benefits; therefore, the disputed services will be reviewed per applicable Division rules and guidelines.

Litigation Background for Needle EMG and MUA

Portions of the Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners rules of practice were challenged by the Texas Medical Association and the Texas Medical Board in 2009. At issue was whether 22 Texas Administrative Code §75.17(a)(3), (c)(2)(D), (c)(3)(A), and (e)(2)(O) were within the scope of chiropractic practice in Texas. Specifically, the parties sought judgment on whether rules allowing Chiropractors to perform needle electromyography (EMG) and manipulation under anesthesia (MUA) were valid. On November 24, 2009, the 345th District Court issued a judgment in which presiding judge Honorable Stephen Yelenosky concluded that needle EMG and MUA exceeded the statutory scope of chiropractic practice in Texas. The Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners appealed the district court's judgment to the Texas Court of Appeals, Third District. The Texas Court of Appeals in *Tex. Bd. Of Chiropractic Examiners v. Tex. Med. Ass'n.*, 375 S.W.3d 464 (Tex. App. – Austin, 2012, pet. den.) issued an opinion affirming the district court's judgment, and concluding that needle EMG and MUA services are not within the chiropractic scope-of-practice. The Chiropractic Board exhausted its appeals and on August 8, 2013, the mandate affirming the district court's judgment was issued. The mandate states "...we affirm the remainder of the district court's judgment that subparts 75.17(a)(3), (c)(2)(D), (c)(3)(A), and (e)(2)(O) of the Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners' scope-of-practice rule are void." In accordance with the Texas Court of Appeals opinion, the final mandate, and the scope of chiropractic practice requirement in 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(6), needle EMG and MUA services may not be reimbursed.

Issues

1. Does a timely filing issue exist?
2. Is the rendering provider eligible to perform needle electromyography?
3. Is the rendering provider eligible to perform nerve conduction tests?
4. Is the requestor entitled to reimbursement for CPT code 99203, 95934, 95903, and 95904?

Findings

1. The respondent states in the position summary that "His fax of 02/01/13 to 866-739-6983 is a fax number for the Dallas Claims Service Center."

Texas Labor Code §408.0272(b)(1)(C) states "Notwithstanding Section 408.027, a health care provider who fails to timely submit a claim for payment to the insurance carrier under Section 408.027(a) does not forfeit the provider's right to reimbursement for that claim for payment solely for failure to submit a timely claim if: (1) the provider submits proof satisfactory to the commissioner that the provider, within the period prescribed by Section 408.027(a), erroneously filed for reimbursement with: (C) a workers' compensation insurance carrier other than the insurance carrier liable for the payment of benefits under this title."

The requestor submitted copies of a fax report dated March 30, 2012 that indicate the bills were intended to be sent to Chartis & AIG. The respondent states that the fax number does not belong to AIG or Chartis, instead the bills were sent to the Dallas Claims Service Center. Therefore, in accordance with Texas Labor Code §408.0272(b)(1)(C), the requestor has not forfeited the right to reimbursement.

2. CPT code 95861 is defined as "Needle electromyography; 2 extremities with or without related paraspinal areas." According to the medical documentation found, this service was performed by Kirt Repp, D.C. (Doctor of Chiropractic). The Texas Court of Appeals in *Tex. Bd. Of Chiropractic Examiners v. Tex. Med. Ass'n.*, 375 S.W.3d 464 (Tex. App. – Austin, 2012, pet. den.) issued an opinion affirming the district court's judgment, and concluding that needle EMG and MUA services are not within the chiropractic scope-of-practice of chiropractors. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(6) states "Notwithstanding Medicare payment policies, chiropractors may be reimbursed for services provided within the scope of their practice act." The division finds that disputed service code 95861 is not within the scope of chiropractic practice because it is an electro-diagnostic test that involves the insertion of a needle into the patient. Therefore, no reimbursement can be recommended for CPT code 95861 pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(a)(6).
3. Disputed services 95903, 95904, and 95934 fall in the category of nerve conduction tests under applicable AMA current procedural terminology (CPT). These tests involve placing a stimulating electrode directly over the nerve to be tested. These are surface tests that do not involve needles. According to the medical documentation found, these services were performed by Kirt Repp, D.C. (Doctor of Chiropractic). As stated in the Texas Court of Appeals, Third District at Austin, NO. 03-10-00673-CV, Opinion dated April 5, 2012

In the second provision, paragraph(c)(3)(A), TBCE imposed certification and supervision requirements on any licenses who administered "electro-neuro diagnostic testing" that varied according to whether the testing was "surface (non-needle)" or involved the use of needles. The import or effect of paragraphs (c)(2)(D) and (c)(3)(A), as the parties agree, was that chiropractors with specified training and certification could utilize needle EMG in evaluating or examining patients. In their live petitions and summary-judgment motions, the Physician Parties challenged the validity of the two rule provisions **specifically addressing needle EMG** [emphasis added]- 75.17(c)(2)(D) and (c)(3)(A) – plus the general standard regarding use of needles-75.17(a)(3)."

That is, surface tests were not in question during this suit. Pursuant to §75.17(c)(3)(A) effective December 24, 2009, 34 *Texas Register* 9208, services 95903, 95904, and 95934 are within the scope of chiropractic practice because they are surface tests. Reimbursement is recommended for these services.

4. Because these studies and evaluation, CPT codes 99202, 95934, 95903, and 95904, are within the scope of chiropractic practice reimbursement is recommended in accordance with 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(c).

Per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.203(c)(1)(2), "To determine the MAR for professional services, system participants shall apply the Medicare payment policies with minimal modifications.

(1) For service categories of Evaluation & Management, General Medicine, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Radiology, Pathology, Anesthesia, and Surgery when performed in an office setting, the established conversion factor to be applied is \$52.83. For Surgery when performed in a facility setting, the established conversion factor to be applied is \$66.32.

(2) The conversion factors listed in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be the conversion factors for calendar year 2008. Subsequent year's conversion factors shall be determined by applying the annual percentage adjustment of the Medicare Economic Index (MEI) to the previous year's conversion factors, and shall be effective January 1st of the new calendar year. The following hypothetical example illustrates this annual adjustment activity if the Division had been using this MEI annual percentage adjustment: The 2006 Division conversion factor of \$50.83 (with the exception of surgery) would have been multiplied by the 2007 MEI annual percentage increase of 2.1 percent, resulting in the \$51.90 (with the exception of surgery) Division conversion factor in 2007."

To determine the MAR the following formula is used: (DWC Conversion Factor/Medicare Conversion Factor) X Participating Amount = Maximum Allowable Reimbursement (MAR).

The 2012 DWC conversion factor for this service is 54.86.

The Medicare Conversion Factor is 34.0376

Review of Box 32 on the CMS-1500 the services were rendered in zip code 77076, which is located in Houston, Texas. Therefore, the Medicare participating amount will be based on the reimbursement for Houston, Texas.

Using the above formula, the Division finds the following:

Code	Calculation for Locality 0440218 Houston	Maximum Allowable
99202	(54.86/34.0376) x \$72.68 for 1 Unit	\$117.14
95903	(54.86/34.0376) x \$75.41 for 8 Units	\$972.33
95904	(54.86/34.0376) x \$56.98 for 16 Units	\$1,469.40

95934	(54.86/34.0376) x \$61.80 for 1 Unit	\$99.61
		\$2,658.48

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, the Division finds that the requestor has established that reimbursement is due for the specified services. As a result, the amount ordered is \$2,658.48.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code Sections 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute. The Division hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor the amount of \$2,658.48 plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this Order.

Authorized Signature

Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	9/25/2013 Date
-----------	--	-------------------

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to seek review of this decision in accordance with 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, effective May 31, 2012, *37 Texas Register* 3833, **applicable to disputes filed on or after June 1, 2012.**

A party seeking review must submit a **Request to Schedule a Benefit Review Conference to Appeal a Medical Fee Dispute Decision** (form **DWC045M**) in accordance with the instructions on the form. The request must be received by the Division within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. The request may be faxed, mailed or personally delivered to the Division using the contact information listed on the form or to the field office handling the claim.

The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §141.1(d).

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.